DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 363 24 TE 000 972

By-Sutton, Rachel S.; Tingle, Mary J.

Developing Competency in Written Composition in Children from Kindergarten through Elementary School by Means of Curriculum Materials. Final Report.

Georgia Univ., Athens. English Curriculum Study Center.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-5-0365
Contract-OEC-4-10-017
Note-91p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.65
Descriptors-*Composition (Literary), *Curriculum Design, Curriculum Development, Curriculum Evaluation, Curriculum Planning, Curriculum Problems, Curriculum Research, *Curriculum Study Centers, Educational Objectives, Educational Research, *Elementary School Curriculum, English Curriculum, *English Instruction, Instructional Materials
Identifiers-*Project English, University of Georgia English Curriculum Study Cen

This report presents the problems and activities of the University of Georgia English Curriculum Study Center in creating a curriculum in written composition for children from kindergarten through grade 6. The design of the curriculum study center is discussed in terms of the rationale behind the study, the necessary basic research, the objectives of the center, and the development of curriculum materials. A series of yearly reports provides a chronological account of the center's operations; and the five books, including 14 individual bulletins, produced by the center are described. Evaluation of the center's materials is presented through an analysis of the skills mastered by students studying under the new curriculum. References used by the center, sample lesson observation records, and a discussion by L. Ramon Veal about the attempt to develop an instrument for measuring composition ability in young children are appended. (See also TE 000 973-TE 000 977.) (LH)

EDO 26363

BR-5-0365
PA-24

WRITTEN COMPOSITION

GRADES K-6

FINAL REPORT

ENGLISH CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GEORGIA

TE 000 972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

WRITTEN COMPOSITION

GRADES K - 6

Final Report

ENGLISH CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER

University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

FINAL REPORT

Project No. H.E. -078

Contract OE 4-10-017

DEVELOPING COMPETENCY IN WRITTEN COMPOSITION IN CHILDREN FROM KINDERGARTEN THROUGH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BY MEANS OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS

July 1, 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

FINAL REPORT

Project No. H.E. -078

Contract OE 4-10-017

DEVELOPING COMPETENCY IN WRITTEN COMPOSITION IN CHILDREN FROM KINDERGARTEN THROUGH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BY MEANS OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS

Rachel S. Sutton and Mary J. Tingle

The University of Georgia

Athens, Georgia

July 1, 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

PERSONNEL OF THE ENGLISH CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER

COORDINATING STAFF

Rachel S. Sutton, Co-Director
Mary J. Tingle, Co-Director
Sue W. Cromartie
Emeliza Swain
L. Ramon Veal
J. W. Richard Lindemann (Co-Director, 1963-1964)
William J. Free (1964-1965)
Jane Appleby (1965-1968)
Warren G. Findley

CONSULTANTS

Dorothea McCarthy
Walter Loban
Arthur H. Livermore
Margaret Early
Ruth Strickland
Alvina Burrows
Hulda Grobman
Kellogg Hunt
Ralph Tyler
J. N. Hook

GRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

Edieann F. Biesbrock (1967-1968)[1]
Alice Christmas (1963-1965)
Carmie T. Cochrane (1963-1964)
Marya DuBose (1965-1968)
Cornelia C. Eldridge (1964-1965)
June Ewing (1963-1966)
Joanne Fudge (1967)
Jessie Post Gough (1964-1965)
Emily B. Gregory (1963-1964)
Ethel Harris (1963-1964)
Emmaline Hendricksen (1963-1964)
Rose Nell Horne (1964-1965)
Virginia Howard (1964-1966)
Nellie Maze (1965-1967)
Marilyn Mathews (1967-1968)
Frances Middleton (1967-1968)[1]
Editha B. Mills (1966-1967)[1]
James Monday (1965-1966)
Rhoda Newman (1964-1965)
Pamela Roffman (1966-1967)
Nan Tomlinson (1965-1966)
Audrey Walker (1966-1968)
Lavinia Wood (1966-1967)

---

[1]In cooperation with the Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation at the University of Georgia.

COOPERATING SCHOOLS

Alps Road School
Athens, Georgia

Centerville Elementary School
Seneca, South Carolina

Doerun Elementary School
Doerun, Georgia

Herman W. Hess Elementary School
Savannah, Georgia

Lake Park Elementary School
Albany, Georgia

Ocilla Elementary School
Ocilla, Georgia

Oglethorpe County Elementary School
Lexington, Georgia

The Savannah Country Day School
Savannah, Georgia

Spring Street Elementary School
Atlanta, Georgia

Trinity School
Columbus, Georgia

Franklin Elementary School
Franklin, North Carolina

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary vii

Chapter One 1

Design of the English Curriculum Study Center

Chapter Two 16

Chronological Account of Operations

Chapter Three 37

Materials for a Curriculum in Written Composition, K-6

Chapter Four 42

Evaluation

References 48

Appendices 51

Appendix A

Lesson Observation Record

Appendix B

Developing an Instrument for Measuring Composition

Ability in Young Children, L. Ramon Veal

SUMMARY

The purpose of the Curriculum Study Center at the University of Georgia (July 1, 1963 - June 30, 1968) was (1) to plan a curriculum in written composition for children in kindergarten through grade six that would enrich children's perceptions and stimulate the process of concept formation so that children would have a wealth of ideas to express and be able to express them clearly, (2) to prepare materials based upon pupils' experiences and pupils' developmental processes, which would promote more intelligent behavior through discriminating use of written language, (3) to use the materials in selected regional schools, and (4) to publish materials for wider use.

A core staff, composed of the directors of the project and selected staff members, and selected classroom teachers (1) produced a working paper based on coordination of ideas contributed by selected representatives of several disciplines which attempted to show (a) relationships between language and thought and behavior as the relationship was viewed by anthropologists, linguists, historians, and representatives of other disciplines, (b) various uses of language required to explore different areas of knowledge and experience and to communicate the findings, and (c) implications of these contributed ideas to the development and evaluation of curricular materials in written composition, with particular reference to the elementary school level; (3) constructed a curriculum in written composition for children from kindergarten through elementary school which placed emphasis upon each child's (a) enlarging his vocabulary through carefully chosen pertinent experiences, (b) de-

veloping respect for and skill in the use of language patterns that are found in his cultural background, (c) rendering the terms he uses more precise and accurate by separating the defining attributes from the nondefining and observing the relationships between them, (d) acquiring and reconstructing meaning from his incubation of ideas and conceptual response to his experience, (e) distinguishing between meaning in the sense of representational symbolism and meaningfulness in the sense of behavioral significance, (f) mastering ideas in a field by use of language in structuring general principles, developing an attitude toward learning and inquiry, employing guesses and hunches, and solving problems that arise, and (g) acquiring habits of independent inquiry through facility with language and library skills; (3) prepared teaching materials which emphasized (a) writing which requires skill in thinking, planning, organizing, and composing, (b) writing that requires the extended development of a single idea, point of view, or sentiment, (c) writing that demands attention to the structure of language, and (d) writing that summarizes the most important concepts from a study; and (4) attempted to match the level of materials (a) to the capacities of students of different abilities, (b) to the varying interests and backgrounds of students, and (c) to the changing purposes and aspirations of students; (5) field-tested these materials in selected regional schools; and (6) revised materials for wider dissemination.

CHAPTER ONE

DESIGN OF THE ENGLISH CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER

The English Curriculum Study Center at the University of Georgia, supported for a five-year period (July 1, 1963 - June 30, 1968), has as its purpose developing competence in written composition in children from kindergarten through grade six by means of curriculum materials based upon relationships between concept attainment and language proficiency.

The rationale of a curriculum is a statement of values about a particular culture, important in education because they give direction to human behavior permitting judgments on what is to be taugnt and the conditions requisite for learning.

Rationale

The curriculum of a school draws upon the nature of the society, the nature of the learners, and the nature of knowledge. Recent curriculum changes have been necessitated by rapid expansion of knowledge, new methods used by scholars to seek new knowledge, new applications of knowledge to everyday life and the resultant demand that learning continue throughout life for a large proportion of the population. Continued learning is ensured most efficiently by an understanding of concepts, principles, and generalizations basic to the structure of a field of knowledge.

Developments in several areas of knowledge about language are basic to the curriculum: contributions of anthropology and sociology to the understanding of language as a social institution; contributions of psychology concerning the interrelations between thought and language,

and the nature of children's language learning; new ways of studying the structure of language and new knowledge of the structure of the English language; and descriptions of the process of composing.

Studies of language in different settings emphasize that it is an instrument made by man to serve his purposes in a social group, and that it has a history of changing as his purposes demand. Its written form results in more stability than its spoken form, but it is the very nature of language as a social institution that it continues to change. A curriculum which promotes understanding of the nature of language will encourage students to seek a variety of ways to use language unhampered by the fear of using an "incorrect" form. An historical view of languages and dialects with their similarities and differences may serve as a prime illustration of the richness of cultural variety, and lessen the tendency to take the provincial view that one's own culture is the "right" one, that to be different is to be inferior.

The language environment of the learner determines his initial language development and defines the language he accepts as his own. Interaction among social groups within any large language community necessitates the individual's becoming aware of and proficient in the use of the several dialects of the larger social community. The written form of the language is an essential learning for the individual who participates widely in important social interaction in present society.

There is some evidence to support the frequently expressed belief that there is a two-way relationship between thought and language. It is apparent that language reflects thinking; it also seems probable that putting thoughts into language serves to increase or to limit the quality and clarity of thinking. On the basis of this belief, the curriculum plans require that writing be an integral part of many aspects of the

total school experience and that the student be encouraged to find its usefulness in his own independent learning in all fields of study. The frequent use of writing should also encourage his involvement in writing as a part of his personal living, as an aid to making his own experiences meaningful and unique.

The individual learns his language through his experiences with other individuals who use the language. In our society experiences with language begin early and continue throughout the life of the individual. Learning language is, therefore, a continuous process, the rate of learning and the depth of understanding of each individual depending upon the experiences with language in which he actively participates. The school arranges for the learner relatively few of these experiences, but plans these few specifically to result in the maximum learning at a rate suitable for each learner.

The most practical basis for maximum learning from experiences is the development of an understanding of the fundamental principles and structure of a field of experience and knowledge. The individual develops understanding of these principles at successively higher levels by learning of an inductive nature. Words and their arrangements occurring and recurring in the context of concrete experiences give them meaning for the hearer. He can be said to "understand" the principles of his language structure when he can use its sounds, words, and arrangements to receive and express meaning. He has generalized this understanding from a number of occurrences, even though he may not be able to state the generalizations. When understanding-in-use has sufficiently developed, he can state principles and see their application in new examples. He continues to deepen and broaden his understanding through conscious application of

principles to new instances and further exploration of their full meaning.

School experiences with language are planned to afford him efficacious opportunities to progress through this sequence of learning. The process is enhanced by conscious and deliberate sampling of the full range of instances in which basic principles apply, suitable to his level of language maturity and ability. This sampling occurs in three forms: (1) language experiences that are anticipatory to the understanding of a basic concept or principle and, therefore, build readiness for future learnings; (2) language experiences that emphasize the concept or principle, including direct teaching of its operation in English; (3) language experiences that maintain understanding of the concept and provide practice in its use through continued exploration and further application. As a given level of mastery in understanding and use is attained, readiness for a higher level may lead again to direct teaching emphasis, and still further exploration and application. Exploration and maintenance of a concept or principle is expected to involve the pupil's spontaneous attention in his normal use of language. Opportunities for spontaneous attention and directed attention are a part of the curriculum plan.

This description of the process of learning language is taken as applicable to the learning of language in oral and written form and in receptive and expressive uses. Each of these aspects differs from each other; the normal process of learning language, however, appears to combine all four in an interplay, learnings in each supporting subsequent learnings in the others. Speech is the basic form of language and, in normal development, precedes and is necessary to writing, although the differences in the two symbol systems require specific learnings designed for each. Similarly, reception through hearing precedes and supports learning to read.

Writing as an integral part of all aspects of the total school experience should augment what the individual makes of his own experience. As the reinforcement of social response aids learning oral language, so the school plans situations in which the writer receives response to communication in writing. The writer, with the teacher's participation, evaluates each written composition against his purpose and his reader's response and thus builds his own criteria for improving the effectiveness of his writing (30).

Basic Research for a Curriculum in Written Composition

Research on the behavior of children from infancy through age twelve offers assistance in defining objectives for the curriculum (32). Those studies that identify development in writing patterns of children are helpful in indicating needed changes in curriculum design. Studies that examine extensive samples of children's writing reveal an overstress on the use of personal experiences, imaginative composition, and letters to the neglect of an emphasis on expository writing that requires the extended development of a single idea or point of view (20, 14, 31).

Children at first use language as a form of play and as an attempt to satisfy other needs (16, 22), feelings (1, 16), and desires (25). Much attention has been given to grammatical analysis, but little to the developmental changes in conceptual thinking and social drives that lie back of verbal expression (13). Through writing, pupils may project information about themselves useful in guidance of learning (19, 27). Impoverished backgrounds often contribute to a lack of motivation in the use of language and also to subsequent intellectual retardation (12, 9). Language usage is most affected by home and neighborhood and least affected by schooling (10).

Interdisciplinary studies of philosophy, psychology, linguistics, sociology, anthropology, and methodology (8) reveal that eminent scholars who are able to make significant contributions to the substantive reorganization of English have not participated previously in curriculum construction. Consequently, the teaching of composition in the elementary school has often dealt inadequately and incorrectly with pertinent contemporary knowledge. The study further reveals that programs in written composition give little attention to planned sequences in learning; for example, the identification of major concepts, values, and skills to be taught; placement in the program where these are first introduced and dealt with subsequently; and reconstruction of major concepts, values, and skills through continuous experiences. Also, the conditions under which children usually write have not contributed to attitudes about writing that encourage optimum effort and learning.

Sentence completeness is a persistent problem. It is related to the complexity of sentence patterns and thought processes (5, 11, 15). Growth in the power to form complete, concise, balanced, consistent sentences is an index of the growth in clear, accurate thinking (17, 29, 34). Judiciously employed, grammar supports usage instruction (21, 23). Children's use of nouns as names of things and verbs for expressing action is more concrete and specific than adults' (3). In order for a child to make discriminations adequately, he has to comprehend that a word has a relatively stable and self-contained meaning and that it is placed in a sentence which itself has a stable structure (35). Writers of textbooks carefully control the school book vocabulary but seem to have no scheme of introducing various sentence patterns (26). It is also true that certain well known and frequently used tests of language skills show poor discrimination power and can be improved (6).

The formation of ideas involves and is dependent on the process of categorizing. A concept is the network of inferences that are or may be set into play by an act of categorizing (4). Teachers, to the great loss of originality, tend to stereotype their own concepts and to think of a thing in only one approved way (7). Children need ample experience as the basis for concept attainment and explicit guidance in concept formation. They need to be encouraged to form unusual classifications, imaginative groupings, and new combinations (28, 24). Children very early form large abstract categories. Abstraction pushed too fast results in the acquisition of words instead of concepts (18). Composition is a means of clarifying, organizing, and applying ideas gained from reading and discussion (19). Children can be helped to use a wide variety of content and expressive phrasing when not restricted to writing on a prescribed subject (2).

Research indicates that the child from birth builds up schemata of segments of reality. Time and well-planned direction are needed to assist him in integrating his bits of knowledge into an orderly system. Research also suggests the need for a curriculum in written composition designed to include concepts that are variously needed in all basic subjects and a more discriminating understanding of the relationship between words and other symbols of meaning. Research has little to report from longitudinal studies of written language growth patterns of individual children.

Operational Objectives of the English Curriculum Study Center

The operational objectives of the project were formulated as follows:

A. To produce a working paper based on coordination of ideas contributed by selected representatives of several disciplines. This

paper would attempt to show (1) the relationship between language and thought and behavior as the relationship is viewed by anthropologists, linguists, historians, and representatives of other disciplines, (2) how written language is used differently to explore different areas of knowledge and experience and to communicate the findings, (3) what implications these contributed ideas have for the development and evaluation of curriculum materials in written composition, with particular reference to the elementary school level.

B. To construct a curriculum in written composition for children from kindergarten through grade six which will plan emphasis upon each child's (1) enlarging his vocabulary through carefully chosen pertinent experiences, (2) developing respect for and skill in the use of language patterns that are found in his cultural background, (3) rendering the terms he uses more precise and accurate by separating the defining attributes from the nondefining and observing the relationships between them, (4) acquiring and reconstructing meaning from his incubation of ideas and conceptual response to his experience, (5) distinguishing between meaning in the sense of representational symbolism and meaningfulness in the sense of behavioral significance, (6) mastering ideas in a field by use of language in structuring general principles, developing an attitude toward learning and inquiry, employing guesses and hunches, and solving problems that arise, and (7) acquiring habits of independent inquiry through facility with language and library skills.

C. To prepare teaching materials with focus on writing (1) which requires skill in thinking, planning, organizing, and composing; (2) that requires the extended development of a single idea, point of view, or sentiment; (3) that demands more attention to the structure of language; (4) that summarizes the most important concepts from a study.

D. To match the level of materials (1) to the capacities of students of different abilities, (2) to the varying interests and backgrounds of students, and (3) to the changing purposes and aspirations of students.

Development of Curriculum Materials

Procedural steps in developing the curriculum are listed as follows:

A. Formulating a statement of concepts about language development and language use (1) by identifying the basic concepts about language that are derived from anthropology, sociology, psychology, and linguistics; and (2) by identifying the significant features of language usage for various purposes. In order to make the basic ideas of different disciplines available to the staff preparing curriculum materials and to teachers using the materials, specialists, thoroughly familiar with research in each discipline, prepared papers and met in seminar with the project staff to discuss the contributions of each field to the study of language and to coordinate the basic ideas into a single statement. Representatives of different areas of language use, mathematicians, historians, journalists, writers of juvenile prose and poetry, and literary critics, also met in seminar to discuss and identify the essential differences and similarities among their needs for language such as the exactness of meaning, chronology of events, change of opinion, direction of action, and stir of emotion.

B. Developing the design for curriculum materials (1) by defining in behavioral terms the major objectives for the program; and (2) by defining the scope of the curriculum in terms of sources of content, structure of written composition, forms of discourse, development of vocabulary, nature of language, and conventions of written composition.

The general objectives of the curriculum in written composition indicate that the child (1) draws upon himself and his world for the content of his writing; (2) uses in his writing a continuously expanding expressive vocabulary; (3) in the process of writing and revising, uses easily and flexibly the structure of the English language; (4) perceives relationships among aspects of his experiences and uses language to express and to shape the concept system by which he orders his experiences and represents his world; (5) develops an understanding of language as a social institution, recognizes the role of written language in society, and accepts the responsibility of writing in keeping with this role; (6) writes effectively at levels of competency commensurate with his level of ability; (7) acquires habit of independence in the process of writing; (8) and uses appropriate conventions associated with the writing act.

The scope of the curriculum in written composition identifies the areas of learning related to content, to the process of composing, to the aspects of composition, and to the evaluation of the progress of students toward the attainment of the objectives. Emphasis is varied as suitable to the level of language development of each child. Kindergarten experiences begin with whatever language ability has been attained. At a later period a suitable level of mastery leads to direct teaching for expansion and systematic summary of the content area. These alternate periods of expansion and maintenance of a concept, skill, attitude, or interest are expected to continue throughout the life of the user of language.

C. Preparing experimental curriculum materials for teaching written composition from kindergarten through grade six on the basis of the master outline.

D. Developing criteria for the evaluation of the newly prepared

curriculum materials when they are used in classrooms. These criteria would be based on the variables and predictive statements to be tested as implied in the objectives of the project and would result in measurements such as the following:

(1) Measurement of the child's awareness that he needs to vary his written composition in accordance with his purpose for writing and that he is able to do so. Frequent writing to which the teacher reacts will be supplemented by systematic testing at intervals, by short format exercises which could be classified as exposition, argument, description, summary, and the like.

(2) Measurement of the child's ability (a) to choose a word with a particular meaning for a given situation, and (b) to appraise his own skill in so doing; for example, measurement of the child's fluency and precision with synonyms by an instrument inviting response to words in and out of context. One gradient might be the complexity of the stimulus (word, phrase, sentence), another the level of abstraction (concrete, functional, abstract, incorrect). Other gradients might be the number of words, the number of relevant words, the number of appropriate equivalents, and the number of words which might apply in other contexts.

(3) Measurement of the child's ability to use the libraries as reservoirs of information, to acquire for himself what he needs to know, and to select what is necessary to accomplish a task of communication. This would be accomplished through anecdotal behavior records, systematic use of exercises designed to elicit critically significant responses, and standardized tests of library skills or work-study skills.

(4) Measurement of the quality of written work before and after instruction both (a) globally, by a standardized measure like the STEP Essay Test, and (b) diagnostically, through standardized measures

of correctness and effectiveness of expression, and by adaptation of the College Board's interlinear type of editing exercise to reflect types of errors and thereby assess the child's spontaneous recognition of an unguided ability to correct various types of faulty expression in written material to produce clear and felicitous prose. Extended exercises modeled after these types would be constructed to measure competence with larger units of thought, namely, paragraphing in essays.

E. Developing observation schedules and procedures and training observers to procure evidence of the incidence of such behaviors as the following:

(1) Overt and verbal response to a wide range of stimuli in the total environment,

(2) Overt and verbal response to rich stimulation furnished in a school environment and use of abundant sources of information,

(3) Response to a wide range of sensory experiences and increasing complexity and variety of ideas and problems,

(4) Free expression of curiosity, feelings, and partly-formed ideas in discussion,

(5) Formation of concepts by integration of cognitive experience through the use of connectives, similarities and differences, time-sequence and cause-effect relationships,

(6) Evidence in written expression of the thinking process. For example, the child structures operational schema for inquiry. He gathers data and constructs explanatory systems with critiques. He formulates hypotheses based on relational constructs. He sees that inquiry becomes increasingly productive as it approximates certain standards of form, strategy, and logic. With practice he discovers the most effective inquiry procedures. The experiment, demonstration, discus-

sion, or report may be tape recorded and played back, and subsequently written and read back. The teacher and child evaluate each question and leading statement in terms of its structure and function. The child comes to use inquiry strategies appropriate to inquiry goals.

F. Trying out experimental materials in selected schools.

The eleven cooperating schools, located in the southeastern region, represent a wide variety of teaching situations: public and private schools, large urban, small town, and rural schools, with pupils from many different socio-economic backgrounds attending. Teachers were guided in the use of the experimental materials by conferences held during the year and by regular visits from the Project Staff. Teachers visited among themselves and communicated frequently with the central office.

G. Evaluating the results of field-testing the materials.

Feedback from teachers after use of each piece of material was obtained by the form that follows:

ENGLISH CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER

The University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Name of Teacher_____School_____

Grade_____Date_____

Title of Bulletin and page number of materials used:

_____

What happened: tell briefly how the experience started and what the children did.

_____

_____

_____

Your evaluation of the usefulness of this experience:

_____

_____

_____

Suggested changes in materials:

_____

_____

_____

If you added activities to those suggested, describe on back of page.

Samples of pupils' written work from the classes using experimental materials were collected and analyzed. Whenever possible each school collected samples of pupils' writing over the five-year period. Because no useful composition scale was generally available for evaluating the writing of very young children (grades two and three), Georgia's Research and Development Center, cooperating with the English Study Center, developed model or comparison essays for the writing of second

and third graders. Ratings, made by four experienced raters, were based on criteria developed by teachers in schools cooperating with the Center. The samples were obtained under standardized conditions (topic, directions, timing) in October, May, and September of 1965-66 from pupils in the eleven cooperating schools (33). The samples were rated by the comparison-essay method, using model essays selected earlier. The scale, with model essays, helped evaluate the compositions of second and third graders who used the Center's materials. These papers were compared with those written by a control group not using the Center's material.

Research studies relating to the evaluation of written composition included an analysis of oral language of first grade children, the use of programmed linguistic reading materials in second grade, relationship of oral and written language of third grade children, understanding of adjectival and adverbial elements, global appraisal of written composition, relationships between understanding of time concepts and written composition, relationships between mathematical reasoning and written composition, and the effects of various stimuli on written production.

CHAPTER TWO

CHRONOLOGICAL ACCOUNT OF OPERATIONS

This chapter is a chronological account of the operation of the English Curriculum Study Center. For each year of the project the "a"-proposed time schedule as specified in the contract, and "b"-activated time schedule described in the quarterly reports show relationships between process and end-product.

July 1, 1963 - June 30, 1964

1. a. Set up project office and organize staff operations.

b. Number 312 Baldwin Hall on the University of Georgia campus became headquarters for the newly created English Curriculum Study Center and continued for its duration. Offices for coordinating staff, graduate research assistants, secretaries, shelves for basic reference and curriculum materials, files, and room for staff meetings were provided by this space. Adjoining 312 was a classroom-laboratory where elementary pupil texts were kept. Here, a complete series of language arts texts, teachers' manuals, and workbooks from 29 publishers were available for use.

2. a. Plan and initiate the meetings of the staff with visiting specialists and prepare statement of basic concepts to be used as foundation for developing curriculum materials.

b. Representatives from the Departments of English, Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology, and Education met regularly in seminar and prepared a statement of concepts relating to language development as it is described in the several disciplines, which became part of the theoretical base for the development of curriculum materials.

3. a. Develop the design and make the master outline for the prepared curriculum materials.

b. The College of Education staff assigned to the project and six selected graduate research assistants worked in teams for a review of the literature related to objectives of a curriculum in written composition. A tentative statement of objectives was prepared for study at the Orientation Conference in May, 1964.

4. a. Select cooperating schools and teachers in each school. Initiate orientation program for the teachers to familiarize them with purposes of the project, basic concepts, types of materials, suggested procedures, and the like.

b. After initial communication with prospective cooperating schools in the Southeastern area by talks to summer meetings of principals and teachers, WGTV presentation, letters, and visits selection was made of ten elementary schools. Twenty-two kindergarten and first grade teachers from these schools were invited to a two-day orientation conference at the Georgia Center for Continuing Education on May 15-16, 1964. The interdisciplinary ideas from anthropology, sociology, psychology, and linguistics upon which the curriculum materials were based were presented to them. Dr. Margaret Early, Syracuse University, and Dr. Alvin Baskoff, Emory University, were visiting consultants who discussed implications of the interdisciplinary ideas for a curriculum in written composition.

5. a. Develop schedules and other plans for securing information through observation in the participating schools.

b. The Lesson Observation Record included in the final report as Appendix A was developed by the staff, tried out in local schools, and revised before it was used in the cooperating schools.

6. a. Write materials for kindergarten and first grade.

b. A proposal for a Developmental Activities Program for visiting college personnel during the summer, 1964, was prepared and submitted to U.S.O.E. The proposal provided for the participation of four college teachers and two graduate research assistants in the study of language of the four-year-old child through taping and analysis of free speech, preliminary to writing kindergarten materials.

July 1, 1964 - June 30, 1965

1. a. Introduce the prepared materials in kindergartens and first grades of selected schools.

b. For two weeks, July 17-31, 1964, twenty-two kindergarten and first grade teachers were instructed in the basic ideas of the Center. They began the study of linguistics, defined specific objectives for the curriculum, planned learning experiences to support the objectives, and devised evaluative instruments. They worked with consultants: Walter Loban and Ruth Strickland on the analysis of children's speech; Alvina Burrows on developing writing ability; Robert Burch on creative writing; and Hulda Grobman on evaluation. Packets of materials containing statements of objectives, framework for development of curriculum, instructional materials, Livermore's paper on the language of the scientist, and a guide for analyzing children's books were distributed to the teachers in each cooperating school.

2. a. Observe procedures in the classroom, the reaction of the children, the quality of work produced, and make records according to the planned schedules. Anecdotal records of pupils' and teachers' performances, samples of students' work, results of the standardized tests or other tests will also be a part of the data used to determine

the usefulness of the materials.

b. Observations, note taking and tape recordings of speech and verbal behaviors of children in kindergarten and first grade settings were begun in Fall, 1964. During visits of the staff to the cooperating schools teachers were encouraged to begin the analysis of each child's verbal behavior from tape recordings and to develop such simple, evaluative format exercises as the following:

(1) Word usage and structure.

Ability to characterize by adjectives (or descriptive phrases), given characters in story, story itself, events or objects.	Read story to child (show object, etc.) and ask that the child give (a) free description ("How would you tell me about this?" "What is this like?") or (b) choice between furnished descriptive adjectives, phrases, etc.

(2) Understanding of relationships (between words, events, and actions).

Ability to choose and relate endings to stories read to them. (a) logic of choice (b) ability to substantiate choice	Read first part of short story and child is asked to complete it. "How could this end?" "What happened then?" "Why?" "How do you know?"

(3) Variety, color, creative aspects of language.

Ability to invent a word, give it meaning and use it in a sentence.	(a) Tell child to say a "new word"-- a "word you have never heard before"-- (b) now, "What could that mean?" (c) "How

could you use that word?"

3. a. Revise K-1 materials, write curriculum materials for second and third grades, and submit to interdisciplinary staff for criticism and evaluation.

b. A detailed sequence for presentation of materials in linguistics and rhetoric was developed with assistance from William Burke (visiting consultant in linguistics from the University of Texas) to determine the nature of materials needed, probable grade levels at which materials may be introduced, and effective means of presenting materials. The K-3 curriculum materials were analyzed by Dorothea McCarthy and Ralph Tyler at the annual teacher-education conference in January, 1965. Teachers from the cooperating schools attended this conference and heard Rolf Larson, Dorothea McCarthy, Lawrence Metcalf, and Ralph Tyler speak on sequence and relationship in learning.

Teachers of K-3 and principals of the cooperating schools met for two days in May to evaluate the work underway and make plans for the next year. Three major presentations contributed to develop understandings about basic ideas involved in the work of the Center:

"Foundations of Language from Sociology and Anthropology," John M. Smith, Jr.; "Foundations of Language from Linguistics," William J. Free; "Research on Writing of Young Children, " Kellogg W. Hunt.

The teachers were given directions about kinds of preparation to make for the summer conference, such as reading of background material, selection of samples of writing for study, and suggestions for development of materials.

July 1, 1965 - June 30, 1966

1. a. Continue using materials in the kindergarten and first grades and introduce materials for second and third grades.

b. From July 18-31, 1965, teachers of second and third grades and selected teachers from kindergarten and first grade in the cooperating schools met to work on teaching materials.

(1) Reviewed and proposed revisions for materials being used in kindergarten and first grade during 1964-1965.

(2) Reviewed under direction of Ralph Tyler objectives and concepts upon which curriculum materials are based.

(3) Developed sample units for use by first, second, and third grade teachers in 1965-1966.

(4) Studied evaluation processes and began developing specific materials and procedures for evaluating usefulness of materials.

Edited and distributed to cooperating schools the trial forms of resource units written during the summer conference:

(a) Development of Vocabulary

Language Structure	Literal and Figurative
Language Variation	Language
Imaginative Writing	
Letter Writing	
Writing Poetry	Reading Poetry

2. a. Make records according to planned schedules.

b. The following request for samples of free writing was made to all teachers in the cooperating schools:

"On April 6 or as near that date as is suitable for your class, get from each child a sample of his free writing. By 'free writing' we mean writing that is done with a minimum of control from you. Let the student write in the way that is characteristic of him and give only the

directions and help necessary to let him proceed comfortably. The length of his paper should be whatever is reasonable for the child; the topic may be chosen in any way that will encourage the child. Do not rewrite the papers.

"Please put a cover sheet with each set of papers to show (1) name of school, (2) grade, (3) name of teacher (We need this so we can match this set of papers with the others that we have received from your school.), (4) short statement of how you set up the situation that motivated the writing, and (5) length of time allowed.

"Since postage on this much material will be fairly expensive, you may hold the papers until someone from the Center visits you--this should be sometime soon.

"Thank you."

3. a. Revise curriculum materials and evaluative devices from suggestions of teachers and observers, write materials for fourth, fifth, and sixth grades and submit materials to interdisciplinary staff for evaluation and criticism.

b. In December, 1965, forty-one teachers from kindergarten through grade 6 and principals from ten cooperating schools came to the Georgia Center for Continuing Education to study and discuss five units on vocabulary, prepared during the fall by staff and graduate assistants. In addition to work on vocabulary development, there were sessions on structure of the language in which materials were developed during the winter quarter.

4. a. , Observe the procedures in the classroom, the reactions of pupils, quality of work produced, and make records according to planned schedules and other evaluative devices considered useful.

b. Staff members from the English Curriculum Study Center visited each of the cooperating schools for the purpose of observing classes, conferring with individual teachers, and serving as consultant to the entire school staff.

At the invitation of Michael Shugrue materials were prepared

for release to the English Institute Materials Center of the Modern Language Association. The Georgia Center was represented at the directors meeting held in New York City.

5. a. Revise curriculum materials and evaluation devices from suggestions of teachers and observers.

b. James C. Bostain, Language Service Institute of the State Department, served as a consultant to the staff of the center. Discussions centered about language learning of disadvantaged children. J. N. Hook served as consultant to the Center staff on trends and developments in the English curriculum. A symposium on the "Teaching of Written Composition" was presented at AERA. Transcriptions of these developments were sent to the cooperating schools.

On May 12-14, 1966, a conference was held for teachers and principals of the participating schools. The interest of all teachers in the work of the Center made it seem reasonable to alter slightly the work plan and to develop some materials for every grade, K-6, and to include teachers from these grades in every work conference.

(1) Materials on language (phonology, morphology, and syntax) were presented for study.

(2) Children's writing from the participating schools was analyzed by teachers to establish relationship of phonology, morphology, and syntax to improve competency in written composition.

(3) Teachers presented written work from their classes and discussed relationship of the work to the curriculum materials which they had used during the year. Suggestions for the revision were given.

(4) Teachers worked on defining models at different grade levels for evaluating children's writing.

Samples of controlled writing were secured from children in

grades 1-6 in the participating schools. These samples become part of the materials used for evaluation of usefulness of materials from the English Curriculum Study Center.

July 1, 1966 - June 30, 1967

1. a. Continue to use materials in K-6 and introduce new materials.

b. A conference was held from July 25-30, 1966, to plan the preparation of resource materials using literary models in the teaching of written composition. Teachers from K-6 who attended concentrated their attention on the analysis of a variety of stimuli for writing and use of children's literature for studying the structure of composition.

2. a. Observe procedures in the classroom, the reactions of pupils, the quality of work produced, and make records according to planned schedules and other useful devices.

b. Members of the staff visited the cooperating schools. The first phase of research necessary for developing model or comparison essays for writing of second and third grade pupils as an extension of the STEP Essay Test has been completed. Cooperation and support of this project has been given by the Georgia Research and Development Center. The GRDC is supporting another project to examine relationships between extensive reading and written production.

Centerville School in Anderson, South Carolina, asked to join the English Curriculum Study Center as the eleventh cooperating school. This school will be used to determine the effectiveness of the ECSC materials when used by teachers who have not been involved in the planning and preparation of materials.

The following materials now in use in the schools were sent to EIMC for use in the summer English Institutes.

(1) History of the English Language, K-6

(2) The Dictionary, K-6

(3) Word Definition, K-6

(4) Sentence Patterns, K-6

(5) Use of Figurative Language in Sixth Grade

(6) Study of Language: Resource Materials

Phonology

Morphology

Syntax

Sentence Patterns

Usage

(7) Structure of Written Composition

(With extensive bibliography of children's literature, useful as models and illustrations of effective writing.)

(8) Foundations of the Curriculum

In December 2-3, 1966, fifty teachers and principals from eleven cooperating schools met to review the materials described above and to plan for experimenting with their use for reporting results to the ECSC. Virginia Reid visited the Center and Alps Road School and reviewed the materials with members of the staff. A paper was presented to AERA on the "Structure of Composition" by a member of the staff. Another member presented a paper to NCME on "Developing an Instrument for Measuring Composition Ability in Young Children."

Fifty-one teachers attended the conference on May 11-13, 1967, to (1) review new materials, (2) submit and discuss materials that had been used in the schools, (3) receive instruction in some of the areas basic to use of the materials: language and structure of composition, and (4) plan for ECSC's activities for 1967-68.

July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

1. a. Continue to use materials in K-6.

b. The staff visited the cooperating schools to observe classroom procedures and consult with teachers.

Six staff members attended the meeting of NCTE in November, 1967, and three participated in the program.

Forty-nine teachers from the eleven cooperating schools met to evaluate and discuss materials with the staff on February 22-24, 1968, at the Georgia Center for Continuing Education. Shelton L. Root, Jr. and William O. Steele served as consultants on generating ideas for composition from children's literature. As a result of this conference and subsequent visits to schools the final editing of materials was done.

A proposal for field testing materials in the English Curriculum Study Center for teaching composition in the elementary school was developed and later approved by the Research and Development Center at The University of Georgia. The program, in two components, is longitudinal, covering a three-year and possibly longer period. The staff assigned to the project will be responsible for (1) in-service training of teachers, (2) participation in work with children through cooperation with the teacher in classroom work and through demonstrations, (3) research on specific problems related to development of ability to compose in oral and written language, (4) evaluation of oral and written composition of the pupil subjects to determine the quality of writing when it is judged by selected criteria and to identify changes in composition ability as students increase in maturity from kindergarten through grade three.

Component I of the program will emphasize the importance of oral language experiences as the basis for oral and written composition and

will concentrate on (1) broadening the subjects' range of experiences, (2) developing vocabulary to enable the subject to verbalize his experiences, and (3) providing structured situations in which the subjects talk about their experiences and subsequently write about them.

Component II is based on the rationale that systematic instruction in written composition should be offered the young child using his direct and indirect experiences to stimulate writing and focus his attention on particular aspects of composing at different levels of complexity. The instructional process should fill the child's environment with a variety of printed stimuli which demonstrate excellence in writing. Selections from children's literature are resource materials for teaching diction, grammatical structures, internal patterns of composition, conventions of genre, and tone in writing that may be used not as a ready-made body of rules but as assistance in the expression of thought and feeling.

PROJECTED THREE-YEAR PROGRAM PLANS

COMPONENT I

A. Curriculum and Instruction

FY 1968-69 Grades K-1	FY 1969-70 Grades K-2	FY 1970-71 Grades K-3
The instructional program for K-1 in composition will focus on:	The program will include K, 1, and 2.	The program will include K, 1, and 2, and 3.
1. Broadening the child's experiences through the (a) development of his ability to observe closely familiar objects and situations, and (b) contact with unfamiliar objects, either directly or vicariously;	Continued Planned observations will be broader in scope than the previous year.	Continued
2. Vocabulary development related to (a) increased sensitivity to ordinary and to new experiences, (b) accurate names for concrete objects, (c) observed situations and personal and vicarious experiences;	Continued	Continued
3. Fluency of expression--to be developed through structured situations for discussion or expansion of experiences and for use of new vocabulary.	Continued	Continued
(Tapes and transcriptions of children's oral language and samples of written language obtained in controlled situations will be the basis for the analyses in the research and evaluation programs.)	Continued	Continued

B. Research

Research Questions:

1. Can a previously developed Essay Test for grades two and three be used effectively at grade one (end of year)?	1. Continue investigations of 1968-69	1. Continue investigations of 1968-69 and 1969-70.

FY 1968-69 Grades K-1	FY 1969-70 Grades K-2	FY 1970-71 Grades K-3
2. What is the relationship between selected aspects of syntax and rated quality of composition?	2. Begin to check on syntactic and rhetorical differences between oral and written language production at various age-grade and ability levels.	2. Can instruments now used at fifth grade level be used at third grade?
3. What is the relationship between selected aspects of syntax and mode of discourse?		
4. Can a carefully planned and effectively executed sequential program in written composition significantly accelerate the development of syntactic mastery in written language?		
5. Can effective modifications in Flanders-Amidon Observation Schedule be made?		

C. Evaluation

Analysis of oral and written specimens according to:	Continuation of 1968-69 procedures plus checking of measures against norms obtained in Biesbrock (1968) dissertation.	Continuation of 1968-69 and 1969-70 procedures.
1. Vocabulary a. comparison against standard word list b. comparison against list of words introduced in instruction c. abstraction index		
2. Syntax a. mean T-unit length (other syntactic structures) b. proportion of well-formed sentences (Bateman and Zidonis)		

FY 1968-69 Grades K-1	FY 1969-70 Grades K-2	FY 1970-71 Grades K-3

c. "errors" in syntax--
   frequency of mal-formed
   sentences (Bateman and
   Zidonis)
d. number of sentence-
   combining transformations
   (O'Donnell)

3. Total essay

   a. global rating
   b. paragraph analysis

4. Knowledge of ... (special tests)

   a. language concepts
   b. concepts in composition (to
      be developed)

COMPONENT II

A. Curriculum and Instruction

The English Curriculum Study Center has prepared materials to improve the teaching of written composition in kindergarten through grade six using, for instructional purposes, selections from children's literature as exemplars of excellence in writing. These materials at each grade level deal with such facets of composition as diction, syntax, tone, and other aspects of style.

Component II is a proposal to continue field testing these materials in two selected schools cooperating with GRDC. Regular teachers, student teachers and/or teacher aids at each site will be instructed in the use of these materials by demonstration, study, and discussion. Although instruction, research, and evaluation during this year will be in K-1, teachers in 2-6 will be involved also.

FY 1968-69
Grades K-1

FY 1969-70
Grades K-2

FY 1970-71
Grades K-3

Instruction in the study of diction will continue in K-1 and 2. Complexities in the selection of the right word will be explored further: root meanings; extended and specialized meanings; current and out-of-date meanings; formal, informal, colloquial and slang expression; suitability of a word for a given context.

Instruction will include the joining of words into sentences and the sequencing of sentences into paragraphs as a writer structures his whole composition. Many appropriate selections from children's literature will be used to illustrate the skill of different authors in selecting a particular word or grouping words into phrases, clauses, and sentences to convey meaning for a given purpose and audience.

Examples from children's literature and writing samples of pupils will be used to show how a writer begins to develop individuality and tone in his composition, how he perceives, organizes, distills, and communicates his experiences to others, how he varies form of writing to obtain a clear, concise expression of thought.

Teachers, student teachers and/or teacher aids will have opportunities in a writing practicum to improve their own writing skills and to establish criteria for recognizing excellence in composition. They will examine in detail the works of such authors as Robert McClosky, Beatrix Potter, Laura E. Richards, Elizabeth

FY 1968-69 Grades K-1	FY 1969-70 Grades K-2	FY 1970-71 Grades K-3
		Yates, Herbert Zim, and others. Special attention will be given to the gradation of these materials and their suitability to the nigh, average, and low achiever.

B. Research

Purpose of Investigation:

1. To verify or refute the commonly held assumption that picture books encourage children to engage in creative activity.
2. To test various "types" of children's books to see whether or not certain ones generate more creative activity than others.
3. To identify the elements of promising types.
4. To construct a simple set of guidelines for the guidance of teachers in future book selection.

Procedures:

1. Select representative samples of book types.
2. Construct large, easily manipulable hand puppets of principal characters in each book.
3. Read aloud from the book to subjects.
4. Discuss story with subjects and introduce them to puppets.
5. Permit subjects to "play" with puppets in an unrestricted situation, without forced dramatic activity.
6. Observe and record conceptual and language behaviors revealed during "free play activity" periods.
7. Encourage subjects to dictate their own plays and stories.
8. Analyze these writing specimens for word frequency, definition, and sentence patterns with contrasts of diction and syntax in dialogue and narrative.

FY 1968-69
Grades K-1

Purpose of Investigation:

1. To continue research specified in FY 1968-1969.
2. To obtain the level of a child's literary taste from his on-the-spot and meditated choices of children's books.
3. To test Arbuthnot's criteria for book selection.
4. To establish levels of literary taste for the slow, average, and fast learner.

Procedures:

1. Select an equal number of award and non-award books. Analyze these books for diction and syntax.
2. Record stories from these books on tape and show pictures while subjects listen to tape.
3. Arrange books on tables for selection during a specified number of "free time" periods and record each subject's choice.
4. Ask subjects to name a favorite book at intervals.
5. Contrast subject's on-the-spot and meditated choices with adult choices as represented by award books to establish criteria for selection and level of taste.
6. Examine subject's scores on PPVT and level of literary taste.

FY 1969-70
Grades K-2

Purpose of Investigation:

1. To continue research specified earlier.
2. To test the hypothesis that a writer's use of verbs, adverbs, and verbals is a sign of maturity in composing.

Procedures:

1. Determine percentage of action words used in selected children's books.
2. Use these books and child's direct experience in composition instruction.

FY 1970-71
Grades K-3

FY 1968-69 Grades K-1	FY 1969-70 Grades K-2	FY 1970-71 Grades K-3
		3. Obtain writing samples of subjects at intervals and make global ratings. 4. Make frequency counts of action words and determine ratio of action words to total number of words used. 5. Examine by analysis of covariance a child's composition score as obtained from global rating, reading, and vocabulary score, level of literary taste, and a-v-vb score.

C. Evaluation

Evaluation in the program will determine how each subject begins to make a verbal response to stimulation, develop a concept of himself as a writer, discover order and progression in reading and writing, associate symbol with meaning, recognize similarity in word sounds, and choose a word with a particular meaning for a specified use.

For this purpose different measures of growth in vocabulary will be used, standardized and teacher-made. Each subject will keep his own writing notebook or tablet to record words, phrases, clauses, and sentences that he composes. He will participate in writing group compositions, such as a letter, story, play, report of a class activity, dialogue, or poem. He will also dictate compositions to his teacher. A longitudinal profile of language behavior will be kept of each subject as he progresses toward mature writing.

FY 1968-69 Grades K-1	FY 1969-70 Grades K-2	FY 1970-71 Grades K-3
	Longitudinal evaluation will indicate how the subject responds to words in and out of context, the number of relevant words in a context, and words that apply in other contexts. It will also show how the subject uses figurative language and varieties of sentence patterns.	
	Frequent writing to which a global analysis is applied will be supplemented by testing at intervals with exercises designed for the curriculum materials dealing with figurative language, adverbial and adjectival modifers, sentence patterns, concept formation, and the like.	
		Evaluation of pupil behavior by observation schedule will continue in the classrooms where these materials are being used experimentally. Revision and modification will be expected.
		Emphasis will be placed on the structure of a composition within a generic form and the contributions that different elements such as diction, transitional and supporting sentences, sequence of paragraphs, and conventions make toward unity of a composition. Appropriate selections from children's literature will offer exemplars against which a subject may appraise his own writing.

During the five-year period the staff participated in a total of ten work conferences with 312 teachers attending. The staff visited and consulted with personnel in the cooperating schools, involving 11 principals, 83 teachers, and 3,669 pupils. The staff also attended meetings of

the Modern Language Association, National Council of English Teachers, Conferences on English Education, American Educational Research Association, and National Council of Measurement in Education. They participated in writing guidelines for the preparation of elementary English teachers, the English Institute Materials Center, and in a number of English Institutes. They served as consultants for State English Curriculum Committees and for local educational groups.

Fifteen research assistants earned the doctor's degree and have obtained positions of leadership in elementary language arts in colleges and universities throughout the country.

CHAPTER THREE

MATERIALS FOR A CURRICULUM IN WRITTEN COMPOSITION, K-6

Materials from the English Curriculum Study Center at the University of Georgia are printed as a series of five books, each related to and supporting the others, and fourteen bulletins.

Books

Book One, Foundations for a Curriculum in Written Composition, establishes a theoretical base from contributions of several disciplines: anthropology, sociology, psychology, and linguistics. It is concerned with the process as well as the product of writing and projects a methodology that draws upon the various subject fields in the elementary grades. It attempts to explain how this particular curriculum reveals its designers' sensitivity to the nature of the society it serves, the nature of the learners, and the nature of the discipline, embracing concepts from many fields and the relationships these concepts have to written composition. 244 pp.

Book Two, Use of Literary Models in Teaching Written Composition, a compilation of resource materials, is based on several assumptions: the desire to write has come often as a result of the enjoyment and stimulation from reading what another has written; the body of writing known as children's literature offers the pupil the possibility of contact with master writers; this association may be systematically encouraged and developed by the teacher. The selections contained in

this volume are examples of distinctive writing styles. 156 pp.

Book Three, A Curriculum in Written Composition, K-3 and Book Four, A Curriculum in Written Composition, 4-6 identify concepts and skills and present illustrative learning experiences designed to develop those concepts and skills needed for effective writing in kindergarten through grade six. Grade level designations are given more to indicate sequence than to assign a body of material to any particular group of children. Background language experiences of individuals or groups of children and their day-to-day verbal needs are the determining factors for the selections of any component of the materials. 300 pp. each.

Morphology, Factual Reporting, Literal Use of Language--Definition, Paragraph Development, Writing Business Letters, Writing Poetry, Using Figurative Language, Usage and Dialect, Using the Dictionary, The English Sentence, Personal Letters, History of the Language, Structure of Written Composition, and Writing Stories and Plays are included in Books Three and Four, and because of innumerable requests from members of English Institutes over the country, they are published separately as bulletins. The brief statements about each bulletin explain further the content of Books Three and Four.

Bulletins

Morphology. This material is designed to guide pupils into understanding words and parts of words as units of meaning. Learning experiences are planned to help pupils see (1) the meaning relationships between the base word and its inflection and (2) the meaning relationships between or among the parts of a derived word. 67 pp.

Factual Reporting. Experience in writing which demands exactness contributes not only to the development of skill in writing accurate

factual reports but also to the ability to observe closely and to see details and relationships among them. 26 pp.

Definition. The purpose of this unit is to help elementary school children become more effective users of words. Within the unit experiences are planned to enable the pupil to see the relationship between meaning and defining, to discern nuances or subtle variations in meaning, and to understand the process of defining. 51 pp.

Paragraph Development. Writers use a variety of patterns to develop paragraphs, many examples of which can be found in children's writing. The suitability of different paragraph patterns to achieve different purposes and to add variety and interest to writing becomes easily discernible. 25 pp.

Writing Business Letters. This material is designed to show the elementary school child the difference between business and friendly letters, to make him aware of his potential relationships with audiences with whom he is not personally acquainted, to help him understand the necessity for a clear, concise, accurate statement of his needs and for the use of the form in which these needs are usually expressed. 33 pp.

Writing Poetry. The writing of poetry is not "taught" in the elementary school; it is recognized and encouraged when it happens. A teacher can elicit its happening. Suggestions for the teacher are put together to emphasize varied and sequential experiences with poetry. 47 pp.

Using Figurative Language. The object of this study is to help children develop their powers of observation to see likenesses which they can express in figurative language. Several types of figures of speech can be identified and enjoyed by children in literature they read, and they may make some use of them in their own speech and writing. 39 pp.

Usage and Dialect. This study is planned to guide pupils (1) in becoming aware of varying usages, (2) in analyzing their own speech habits in terms of conventionally appropriate usage, or standard usage, and (3) in acquiring habits of usage appropriate to varying purposes and audiences. 65 pp.

Using the Dictionary. Materials for K-3 introduce the dictionary as a reference book, develop skills in alphabetizing and introduce root words, prefixes, and suffixes. A unit on use of the dictionary in Grade 5 explores the various kinds of information provided by a dictionary. Materials for Grade 6 extend the skills in use of dictionary and relate the information in Dictionary to units on Dialects and The History of the English Language. 36 pp.

The English Sentence. Materials in this bulletin are planned to develop "sentence sense" and to lead to the discovery of the constituents of English sentences and the relationships among these constituents. 55 pp.

Personal Letters. The writing of personal letters is done as need for letter writing occurs. The teacher does not leave this to chance but contrives situations in which letter writing is needed. The sample experiences included in this bulletin are suggestions only. 37 pp.

History of the Language. Knowledge about the evolution and change in language helps the pupil to understand his own language and use it effectively. Learning experiences described in this bulletin for young and older pupils are planned as ventures with language from the present into past times. 30 pp.

Structure of Written Composition. This bulletin attempts to show that the elements of composition are not only related to each other but to the purpose of the writer and his intended message for a given audience. The unit for analysis is the entire composition. 40 pp.

Writing Stories and Plays. The materials on stories and plays are designed to encourage fluency and skill in using language to shape the details of direct, vicarious, or imagined experiences into well-constructed narratives. The emphasis is upon development of sequence; the relationships among time, place, characters, and mood; variety in characterization; the importance of description; the structure of the story through recognition of beginning, middle, and ending; and point of view. 36 pp.

Book Five, Research in Cognate Aspects of Written Composition, is composed of a series of cross-sectional studies in the multiple approach to the process of composition, structure of the language, and methods of presentation. These studies are valuable in understanding the ecology of a language and in the development of criteria for the evaluation of these curriculum materials when they are used in the classroom through analysis of composition behavior and definition of relevant variables to be tested. 96 pp.

The curriculum materials prepared within the limits of this project provide the basis for the development of extensive and comprehensive curriculum materials which may be adapted for use in a wide variety of schools. The materials are at a stage to warrant their extensive trial and development in demonstration centers.

CHAPTER FOUR

EVALUATION

As the original proposal stated, several procedures for evaluation were to be followed. It was also stated that these procedures would be tentative and carried out to obtain an indication--not a definitive assessment--of the effectiveness of the developed materials. These proposed procedures, along with their planned implementation, are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that several studies have been completed and others have been initiated. Only the study of conventions is not yet begun. In all cases, however, the proposed procedures will be continued in the planned follow-up field testing of the developed materials described in Chapter Two of the final report.

Of all the procedures proposed in Table 1, the "global" estimates of overall composition performance have been carried out most extensively at the second and third grade levels. Although attachments in Appendix B describe the results of the global evaluation, a brief summary of those procedures follows.

In the first place, the global evaluation of composition involved ratings of composition quality. Therefore, the usual unreliability of such ratings was a problem that had to be met. Procedures to minimize these problems were followed (33) and the resulting reliabilities are reported in Tables 2 and 3. Together, the cited coefficients indicate an essay test--or composition test--with reliabilities as high as those usually reported for such tests (33).

Validity estimates derived from a comparison between (1) global essay scores and (2) essay scores based on criteria and teacher ratings of quality were also obtained. These comparisons yielded coefficients of .71 and .48, with independent ratings by criteria producing a higher correlation with global scores than the correlation between teacher ratings and global scores.

TABLE 1

Proposed Evaluation

Kinds of Measures (used on actual writing samples)	
Global--(overall quality)--comparison method for structured samples (33).	
Syntax--Hunt's "T" unit and other selected structures (from structured samples) (33).	
Vocabulary--(1) compare with standard word lists; (2) relate to concept development (concepts about language); (3) relate to number and kind of words written (abstraction index); (4) relate to syntax, paragraph structures, and overall quality.	
Conventions--(including spelling)--(1) number and kind at each level; (2) free vs. structured samples; (3) errors related to mode and amount of writing;	
(1) for global investigations, compare with control group--subjects statistically "matched" via base-line measures (reading ability and mental maturity); also growth over two-year period to be noted;	
(2) additional study involves checking mode-of-discourse variance by age or grade level and ability level;	
(3) systematic classroom observation records--relate to kind, amount, and rated quality of writing, now in developmental stages.	

TABLE 2

Rater Reliabilities

Forms	Subjects	Raters	Correlations
A	266	5	.76
B	203	5	.73
C	258	5	.86
D	290	5	.74
E	103	3	.80

TABLE 3

Test-Retest Reliabilities

Test Forms	Correlation	Test Forms	Correlation
A-B	.61	B-D	.62
A-C	.66	B-E	.78
A-D	.71	C-D	.58
A-E	.85	C-E	.62
B-C	.70	D-E	.89

Global scores were examined for 100 pupils in the classrooms of schools which cooperated for two years with the ECSC. As shown in Table 4, changes in scores over a two-year period indicate significant growth during the first year but not between the first and second year or during the second year. For the first year, subjects included second and third graders; and, for the second year, they included third and fourth graders.

TABLE 4

Essay Scores for Two-Year Period

Subjects	F-66	Sp-67	F-67	Sp-68
Boys (N=50)	3.14 --*--	4.53	4.55	4.83
Girls (N=50)	3.38 --*--	4.62	4.80	4.81
Total (N=100)	3.28 --*--	4.58	4.69	4.82

*difference significant at the .01 level

It should be noted also that, for subject variables, a significant difference was found between boys and girls at the third grade and that significant correlations (low .60's) were found between reading scores and global essay quality.

Overall, then, essay quality was judged to improve during one year of the study. And this improvement was certainly found to be reliable; it was also shown to be related to tested reading ability and sex (girls) at the third grade level. Other effects and relationships are to be examined in subsequent studies.

TABLE 5

Mode of Discourse Variance

Purposes

1. Check Mode of Discourse Variance
2. Compare Study Center Schools with Control Group
   a. Use three grades: 2, 4, and 6
   b. Block into ability levels (reading and mental maturity)
   c. Write in 4 modes

   Thus, analysis by -- Mode
   Age or Grade
   Ability levels

Ability

(Reading and/or Mental Maturity)

Grade	High	Middle	Low
2	N D E A	N D E A	N D E A
4	N D E A	N D E A	N D E A
6	N D E A	N D E A	N D E A

N -- Narration
D -- Description
E -- Exposition
A -- Argument

TABLE 6

Control Group Scores
Fall 1967 Essay Testing

	Grades		
	2	4	6
Description	2.81 (3.54)	3.76	4.81
Exposition	2.37 (3.72)	3.44	4.19
Narration	2.65 (3.54)	3.64	4.67
Argument	2.59 (2.82)	3.80	4.93

Scores based on 7-1 scale and comparison ratings.

Scores in parentheses--the only currently available norms based on sample of 900 Georgia elementary school children who wrote essays on the same topics, under standardized conditions, at the end of grades two and three.

REFERENCES

1. Ausubel, David P. The Psychology of Meaningful Verbal Learning. New York: Grune & Stratton, Inc., 1963.

2. Betzner, J. "Content and Form of Original Compositions Dictated by Children from Five to Eight Years of Age," Teachers College Contributions to Education. Bulletin No. 442. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1930.

3. Brown, Roger W. "Linguistic Determinism and the Parts of Speech," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55 (1957), pp. 1-5.

4. Bruner, Jerome S., and J. J. Goodnow, and L. Austin. A Study of Thinking. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.

5. Church, Joseph. Language and the Discovery of Reality. New York: Random House, 1961.

6. Clymer, Theodore. "Study of the Validity of the California Test of Mental Maturity, Elementary Language Section," Eighteenth Yearbook, pp. 125-135. Ames, Iowa: National Council on Measurement in Education, 1961.

7. Davis, Allison. Social-Class Influence upon Learning. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

8. English Curriculum Study Center. Introductions: Working Papers on Language. Bulletin No. 1. Athens, Georgia: English Curriculum Study Center, 1965.

9. Findley, Warren G. Learning under Difficulties. Atlanta: Atlanta Board of Education, 1960.

10. _____. "Use and Interpretation of Achievement Tests in Relation to Validity, " Eighteenth Yearbook, pp. 23-34. Ames, Iowa: National Council on Measurement in Education, 1961.

11. Frogner, Ellen. "Problems of Sentence Structure in Pupils' Themes," English Journal, 22 (1933), pp. 742-749.

12. Goldfarb, William. "Psychological Privation in Infancy and Subsequent Adjustment," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 15 (1945), pp. 247-255.

13. Goodenough, Florence L. "Use of Pronouns by Young Children: A Note on the Development of Self-Awareness," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 52 (1938), pp. 333-346.

14. Grommon, Alfred H. "Preparing High School Students for College Composition," California Journal of Secondary Education, 28 (1953), pp. 113-118.

15. LaBrant, Lou. "A Study of Certain Language Developments of Children in Grades 4-12, Inclusive," Genetic Psychology Monographs, 14 (1933), pp. 387-391.

16. Lewis, Morris M. Infant Speech: A Study of the Beginning of Language. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1951.

17. Livermore, Arthur H. "The Use of Language by Scientists." Unpublished transcribed speech. English Curriculum Study Center, University of Georgia, 1964.

18. McCarthy, Dorothea. "Language Development in Children," Manual of Child Psychology, ed. L. Carmichael, 492-630. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1963.

19. Meckel, Henry C., J. R. Squire, and V. T. Leonard. Practices in the Teaching of Composition in California Public High Schools. Bulletin No. 5. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1958.

20. Meckel, Henry C. "Research on Teaching Composition and Literature," Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N. L. Gage, 966-1006. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

21. Moffet, James. "A Structural Curriculum in English," Harvard Educational Review (Winter 1966), pp. 25-28.

22. Piaget, Jean. The Construction of Reality in the Child. New York: International Universities Press, 1954.

23. Pooley, Robert C. Teaching English Grammar. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

24. Serra, Mary C. "A Study of Fourth Grade Children's Comprehension of Certain Verbal Abstractions," Journal of Experimental Education, 22 (1953), pp. 103-118.

25. Shirley, Mary. "Common Content in the Speech of Pre-School Children," Child Development, 9 (1938), pp. 333-346.

26. Strickland, Ruth G. Language Used by Elementary School Children and Its Relationship to the Language of Reading Textbooks and the Quality of Children's Reading Skill. School of Education Bulletin No. 4. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1962.

27. Sutton, Rachel S. "Analysis of Factors Related to Educational Achievement," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 98 (1960), pp. 193-201.

28. _____. "Behavior in the Attainment of Economic Concepts," Journal of Psychology, 53 (1961), pp. 37-46.

29. Symonds, Percival M. and Helen F. Daringer. "Studies in the Learning of English Expression," Teachers College Record, 32 (1930), pp. 50-64

30. Swain, Emeliza. "Rationale for a Curriculum in Written Composition." Paper Prepared for English Curriculum Study Center, University of Georgia, 1966.

31. Templin, Mildred C. Certain Language Skills in Children: Their Development and Interrelationships. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1957.

32. Tyler, Ralph W. Unpublished transcribed conference session. English Curriculum Study Center, University of Georgia, January, 1965.

33. Veal, L. R. "Developing an Instrument for Measuring Composition Ability in Young Children." Paper Read at N.C.M.E., New York City, 1967, (Appendix B).

34. Watts, A. F. The Language and Mental Development of Children. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1944.

35. Werner, Heinz, and Edith Kaplan. "Development of Word Meaning through Verbal Content," Journal of Psychology, 29 (1950), pp. 251-257.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LESSON OBSERVATION RECORD

WRITTEN COMPOSITION
Lesson Observation Record

School_____ Teacher_____ Grade Level_____

Observer_____ Date_____ Observation Time_____

I. Readiness Stage of Lesson (check in appropriate spaces)

A. Sources of Ideas Provided (yes___ no___)

1. Real Experiences	Yes	No	2. Vicarious Experiences	Yes	No	3. Imaginative Experiences	Yes	No
through performance			through still pictures			through building from factual		
smelling			series of still pictures			through building from fictional		
touching			motion picture, silent					
tasting			motion picture, sound					
listening to real sounds			recording					
seeing real objects			oral reading by teacher					
examining			oral reading by pupil					
experimenting			silent reading					
			Listening to oral presentation					
			observing demonstration					

WRITTEN COMPOSITION
Lesson Observation Record

School_____ Teacher_____ Grade Level_____

Observer_____ Date_____ Observation Time _____

I. Readiness Stage of Lesson (check in appropriate spaces)

B. Nature of treatment of experience

	Yes	No
1. Introduced new and novel experience		
a) by the teacher		
b) by pupils		
2. Related to previous experience		
a) by the teacher		
b) by the pupils		
3. Discussion evolved from experience		
a) initiated by teacher		
b) initiated by children		
c) contributions by teacher		
d) contributions by pupils		
4. Discussion reflected varied thinking		
a) recall		
b) association		
c) generalizations		
d) inference		
5. Discussion led to writing		
a) through teacher assignment		
b) through pupil request		

WRITTEN COMPOSITION
Lesson Observation Record

School _____ Teacher _____ Grade Level _____

Observer _____ Date _____ Observation Time _____

I. Readiness Stage of Lesson

C. Interrelationship of Purpose, Audience, and Writing

	Purpose	Audience	Relationship of Purpose to Audience	Relationship of Purpose to Writing	Relationship of Audience to Writing
No evidence of consideration					
Teacher established					
Children established					
Teacher and children established					

WRITTEN COMPOSITION
Lesson Observation Record

School _____ Teacher _____ Grade Level ____

Observer _____ Date _____ Observation Time _____

I. Readiness Stage of Lesson

D. Guidance in Selecting and Organizing Ideas for Written Composition (check appropriate spaces)

	Review of Main Points	Review of Sequence	Review of Details
1. No evidence			
2. Teacher tells			
a) in terms of purpose			
b) in terms of audience			
3. Teacher elicits			
a) in terms of purpose			
b) in terms of audience			
4. Children volunteer			
a) in terms of purpose			
b) in terms of audience			
5. Teacher and children discuss			
a) in terms of purpose			
b) in terms of audience			

WRITTEN COMPOSITION
Lesson Observation Record

School _____ Teacher _____ Grade Level _____

Observer _____ Date _____ Observation Time _____

I. Readiness Stage of Lesson

E. Materials available for use in writing (check appropriate spaces)

	Adequate for apparent needs	Inadequate for apparent needs
Paper		
Other writing surface		
Pencil		
Other writing tool		
Wordlist previously compiled by teacher		
Wordlist compiled by teacher as requested by children		
Dictionary		
Reference books		
Other informational material		
Illustrations of writing forms		
Illustrations of punctuation		
Illustrations of capitalization		
Illustrations of sample sentence patterns		

WRITTEN COMPOSITION
Lesson Observation Record

School_____ Teacher_____ Grade Level_____

Observer_____ Date_____ Observation Time_____

II. The Writing Stage of the Lesson

A. Teacher Behavior (Check appropriate spaces)

	Spelling	Punctuation	Clarification in recall	Guidance in organization	Guidance in elaborating ideas
1. No evidence of teacher response					
2. Gave help as requested					
3. Alert to needs. Gave help without request					
4. Encouraged independence in pupils					
5. Help seemed adequate to needs					
6. Help seemed inadequate to needs					
7. Showed approval					
8. Showed disapproval					

WRITTEN COMPOSITION
Lesson Observation Record

School_____ Teacher_____ Grade Level___

Observer_____ Date_____ Observation Time_____

II. The Writing Stage of the Lesson

B. Pupil Behavior (Circle number most accurately representative)

1. Use of time

a. Began to write immediately

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

b. Worked consistently until first draft was finished

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

c. Made several false starts

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

d. Worked spasmodically

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

2. Use of help in content of writing

a. Sought help from teacher

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

b. Sought help from other pupils

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

c. Sought help from reference materials

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

3. Use of help in mechanics of writing

a. Sought help from teacher

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

b. Sought help from other pupils

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

c. Sought help from reference material

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

II. The Writing Stage of the Lesson -- Continued

B. Pupil Behavior (Circle number most accurately representative)

4. Frequency of need for help

a. Sought teacher's help frequently

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

b. Sought teacher's help rarely

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

c. Sought no help from teacher

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

d. Frequently sought help from materials

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

e. Rarely sought help from materials

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

f. Sought no help from materials

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

g. Frequently sought help from other pupils

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

h. Rarely sought help from other pupils

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

i. Sought no help from other pupils

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

---

5. Interest evidenced

a. Eagerness and interest obvious throughout writing

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

b. Eager at beginning. Interest waved

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

c. Little interest evidenced

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

II. The Writing Stage of the Lesson - Continued

B. Pupil Behavior (Circle number most accurately representative)

5. Interest evidenced -- Continued

d. No interest evidenced

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

---

6. Overt behavior related to writing accomplishment

a. Evident pride

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

b. Evident dissatisfaction

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

c. No evidence of feeling

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

WRITTEN COMPOSITION
Lesson Observation Record

School_____Teacher_____Grade Level_____

Observer_____Date_____Observation Time_____

III. Proof-Reading Stage of Lesson

Evidence of proof-reading (yes____ no____)

(Circle number most accurately representative)

1. Purpose of proof-reading accepted by pupils

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

2. Papers proof-read by teacher

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

3. Pupils proofing own writing

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

4. Pupils proof-reading other pupil's writing

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

5. Papers proof-read by teacher and pupil together

0% 10% 30% 50% 70% 90% 100%

WRITTEN COMPOSITION
Lesson Observation Record

School _____ Teacher _____ Grade Level _____

Observer _____ Date _____ Observation Time _____

IV. Follow-Up of Lesson	Yes	No
1. Writing used for intended purpose		
2. Intended audience receives writing		
3. Response from audience gives writer a sense of completion of the communication act. (add comments)		
4. Plans for future writing (add comments).		

APPENDIX B

DEVELOPING AN INSTRUMENT FOR MEASURING COMPOSITION ABILITY IN YOUNG CHILDREN

L. Ramon Veal

DEVELOPING AN INSTRUMENT FOR MEASURING COMPOSITION ABILITY IN YOUNG CHILDREN (Grades two and three)[1]

L. Ramon Veal, University of Georgia

Introduction

In 1963, the English Curriculum Study Center (ECSC) at the University of Georgia began developing a curriculum in written composition from kindergarten through grade six. The purposes of this curriculum project relate directly to the development of the evaluative instrument described in this paper.

Briefly, this curriculum in written composition is based on two kinds of objectives (Tingle and Gregory, 1966). The first type focuses on the basic components of written composition: the development of requisite concepts and vocabulary, mastery of syntax, and skill in using the conventions of the English writing system. Evaluation related to this kind of purpose includes assessment of pupils' vocabulary acquisition, their knowledge about and use of basic syntactic structures, and their use of conventions (including spelling).

A second kind of objective focuses on the composition itself--the product--in its larger aspects: its content, its organization, its style; or, quite simply, its overall or global quality. And here evaluation involves the actual products of classrooms that use the newly developed curricular materials. It is our progress so far in this second aspect of evaluation that is the subject of this paper.

---

[1]Paper read at annual meeting of NCME, New York, 1967, and based on projects supported jointly by the English Curriculum Study Center (USOE) and the R & D Center (USOE) of the University of Georgia.

Since the curriculum includes all elementary grades, we need evaluative instruments to use at all levels. In our preliminary work, the STEP Essay Test had proved useful at the intermediate or upper elementary level, but no instrument seemed available for use at the primary level, particularly grades 2 and 3. We are attempting, therefore, to develop an evaluative instrument--like the STEP Essay--that will yield reliable estimates of the overall quality of writing samples produced by second and third grade children.

Problems

The problems or variables in essay grading are perhaps too well known to need further elaboration here. However, as they have been enumerated by Anderson (1960), Braddock and others (1963), they can be listed as:

1) A writer variable--the tendency of a person to fluctuate considerably in his writing performance from one occasion to another;

2) An assignment variable--the time alloted for writing, the mode of discourse required, and the conditions under which the writing is done;

3) A rater variable--the tendency of a rater to vary his rating from occasion to occasion because of his changing standards, his knowledge of a particular writer, or even his own fatigue;

4) A colleague variable--the tendency of raters not to agree because of differing criteria and procedures for rating.

General Procedures

While developing our instrument, we have attempted to control these variables. For the writer variable, we recognize the desirability of providing several test re-test situations, and we have allowed for these; however, our sample population, now including over 2,000 pupils from every kind of academic, social, and economic environment Georgia has to offer, is assumed to provide a representative sample of the writing performance of second and third grade

pupils. It is at this point that our R & D Center in Early Educational Stimulation, in addition to developing a useful, reliable instrument, is interested in identifying typically excellent, average, and poor writing performances at these early educational levels.

The assignment variable was controlled, at least in part, by standardizing the time, topic, and testing condition, as illustrated in the sample in Appendix A.

The rater variable was then initially controlled by providing criteria that had been (1) identified in the literature as important in evaluating the writing of young children and (2) ranked as to importance by the forty teachers cooperating with the ECSC. In addition these initial ratings were made only after training sessions and under standardized conditions. Later, after this first rating produced reliably rated models (.87) that represented--according to the criteria--high, average, and low quality, comparison essays were provided to illustrate points on the rating scale (see examples in Appendix B).

To control for the fourth major variable, that of agreement among colleagues, several procedures were employed. Together these procedures--both experimental and statistical--produced the main estimates of rater reliability which, for this or any other essay test, is the primary determinant of the usefulness of the instrument. A detailed summary of the specific procedures to control the colleague variable is therefore in order.

Specific Procedures

As already implied, a sample of 400 papers obtained in the fall and spring of 1965-1966 provided the initial essays from which model or comparison essays were selected. Again, as previously noted, the models were selected

from papers reliably rated by four trained raters on a seven-point scale according to agreed-upon criteria. These models were then used to rate--via the comparison method--comparably produced essays obtained in the fall of 1966. The fall sample included at least one second and third grade class from each of the ten schools cooperating with the ECSC, and equalled 1022, approximately 250 papers for each form or topic. In addition, to check on examinee and test reliability, a random sample of classes wrote two essays, some on the same topic twice and others on different topics. All papers were rated by trained teachers using the model essays for comparison.

A further check included comparison ratings by untrained readers who were elementary education majors with different academic specialities. This check was made on a random sample of the 1022 papers obtained in the fall of 1966.

Product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated between raters, between forms, and between rating methods and are reported in Tables 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 in Appendix C. The one exception in Table 3 reports intraclass correlation coefficients, as recommended by Ebel (1951), for the large number of untrained readers. Also, where appropriate, coefficients are changed to Fisher's z's according to Garrett's (1958) recommended procedure for testing the significance of the difference between correlation coefficients. Finally, means and standard deviations were computed for raters and test forms on the overall sample and are reported in Table 7, with t ratios used to check for significant differences between means and F tests used for the variances.

Results and Discussion

At this point, normal procedures for test development dictate that the current results be used as feedback data for test revision and test improvement. The results reported herein will be so used; however, several generalizations and implications can be drawn from the data collected so far.

First, inter-rater reliability (Table 1) was found to be high (.75 or better). In fact, it is significantly larger than that achieved in typical ratings made by English teachers (.50) and comparable to that typically reported (.70) for trained raters (Diederich, 1964). Furthermore, readers with different academic backgrounds (Tables 2 and 3) rated a sample of papers almost as reliably (.64) as experienced readers.

Of interest, too, is the fact that the addition of raters--from 1 to 3 to 5 to 14--confirms, as Table 3 reports, what Guilford (1954, p. 397) has noted, namely, that "There is usually much to be gained by adding the first two or three raters, but not much after reaching five." In fact, the increase in reliability from .619 for one rater to .887 for five parallels the kind of increase in reliability produced for objective tests by adding items.

It is also noteworthy that a comparison between ratings made strictly by criteria and those made according to models reveals a significant difference between the methods on two forms, A and B. As Table 6 shows, the models method yielded a z coefficient of .91 in contrast to .45 for Form A and .95 in contrast to .59 for Form B. The other Forms, while showing reliability estimates for models higher than those for criteria, did not yield significantly different coefficients.

The significantly higher rater reliability for Form C, as shown in Table 1, suggests a rating difficulty (or ease) that grows out of the topic itself. For this form, or for its parallel forms, an adjustment will need to be made if consistent rating reliability is to be reported for all forms.

In this connection, as Table 7 illustrates, the mean rating for form D is significantly different (lower) from the means of the other forms. The mean variances for the four forms, however, when compared via Edwards' (1954) recommended F-test procedure, did not show significant differences. Thus, an adjustment will need to be made for any subsequent scores reported for form D.

As Ebel (1966) points out, a high rater reliability may not be accompanied by high examinee or test reliabilities. Such is the case with the data collected so far. Although checks were not so extensive here as they were for rater reliability, Tables 4 and 5 report results of small-scale tests of examinee and test reliability. A moderately high coefficient was found for all forms in a test re-test situation. Using the comparison method, two raters yielded reliability estimates ranging from .489 to .687, with an arithmetic mean of .594 (Table 4). The same two raters rated a similarly small sample of papers from an equivalent forms check. The resulting coefficients, reported in Table 5, range from .581 to .710, with again an arithmetic mean of .647 found.

Summary

With several specific qualifications noted, reliability estimates for an Essay Test for grades 2 and 3 can be reported. For rater reliability, the coefficients range consistently from the low .60's to the mid 70's. At present, slightly higher coefficients could be expected for form C.

Examinee reliability, though based on a limited sample, can also be expected to range in the .60's, as can test reliability. Current results from the test, however, suggest that, on the recommended 7-point scale, the mean of scores from Form D can be expected to be about one-half standard deviation below the means of the other three forms.

Finally, the topics with their comparison or model essays yield reliability estimates as high--and in some cases higher than--ratings based on criteria, even if the raters are untrained. In addition, they are comparable to those reported in the ETS Manual (Handbook) for STEP Essay Tests.

Further Study

Since reports of ratings of young children's writing are limited, comparisons are difficult to make. Even so, the summaries of research in this area (Braddock and others, 1963) point out at least two other variables that need to be considered, namely, length of composition and handwriting.

Although raters can be said to agree on a rating of papers produced by the developed Essay Test, what elements of the composition they agree on is not so clear. Further studies of the instrument, with experimental or statistical control of length of composition and handwriting, will need to be made, as will additional analysis of other possible sources of variance in ratings.

References

1. Anderson, C. C. The new STEP essay test as a measure of composition ability. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1960, 20, 95-102.

2. Braddock, R. et al. Research in Written Composition. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

3. Diederich, P. B. Problems and possibilities of research in the teaching of written composition, in Research Design and the Teaching of English. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

4. Ebel, R. L. Estimation of the reliability of ratings. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 407-424.

5. Ebel, R. L. Measuring Educational Achievelment. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

6. Edwards, A. L. Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

7. Garrett, H. E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1958.

8. Gregory, Emily and Tingle, Mary. Foundations for a Curriculum in Written Composition, K-6. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, 1967.

9. Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

10. Handbook for Essay Tests. Manual for STEP Essay Tests, Level 1. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1955-7.

Appendix A

English Curriculum Study Center
312 Baldwin Hall - University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Form B

To the Teacher:

We are sending each of you at this time a proposed topic to have each child in your class write on at a scheduled time during the next two weeks. After the papers have been collected, we should like to receive them by mail so that we can select samples to use in scaling the tests. PLEASE DO NOT MAKE CORRECTIONS. We need papers exactly as they were first written to use for samples. (A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed).

Allow about 45 minutes altogether. Give each child the kind of paper on which he is accustomed to write. The first five or ten minutes may be required to distribute the papers and prepare the children for writing. If you wish, you may save time by putting each child's name at the top of his paper and then supplying later his age in years and months, the name of the school, the day's date. Or you may ask the children to supply that information. You should use the general directions below. Modify them only if they do not apply in some particular and let us know the modification made. (This is to help us find how well the directions work.)

General Directions: "Today we want you to write a composition. First, read the statement of directions on your paper while I read it to you."

"Some of the days we celebrate in our country are Christmas, the Fourth of July, Easter, Thanksgiving, Halloween, and your birthday. We celebrate each of these in a special way. Tell which of these days you like best and why you chose this one. Tell how we celebrate this day. Tell the things you and your family do to make this a happy day."

"Now, take a little time to plan what you want to say before beginning to write the composition. Make some notes if that will help you. Remember that we are most interested in what you have to say and how well you say it. Please write clearly enough so we can read what you say. Start!"

After five minutes:

If after five minutes some students have not begun writing, encourage them to begin.

After thirty more minutes say:

"STOP, even though you have not finished."

Collect the papers, the pupil direction sheets (with name, etc.) and the pupils' writing. Mail to the English Curriculum Study Center, Baldwin Hall, University of Georgia, Athens. Use the enclosed envelope.

THANKS.

Appendix B (1)

Criteria Trial Ratings -- Directions

Using the scale below, rate the attached compositions on the basis of three factors:

Content 50%

-- organization of ideas (a plan)

-- clear purpose (main idea)

-- ideas tied together (transitions)

Style 30%

-- original

-- expressive of feelings

-- free and spontaneous, shows movement, fluency

Mechanics 20%

-- complete sentences

-- "correct" grammar

-- conventional punctuation and paragraphing

Read each paper once and try to judge it as a whole, keeping in mind the relative weight of each of the major factors listed.

Scale

6 -- superior
4 -- average
2 -- poor

} Basic Scale

Additional ratings which may be used:

7 -- decidedly superior

5 -- better than average but not superior

3 -- not quite average

1 -- very poor

APPENDIX B (2)

Comparisons for Holidays (Form B)

Rating 2

(1) I like Christmas becaure we get toys we go to buy toys.
I am going to hang ub my stocking

(2) I chose this one because I like it.
Im going to have presents for my Me Birthday.
The best of all is baseball.
I like my presents.
The best one in the world is Jesus.

Rating 4

(1) I like my birthday very much because I like to get presents. My family and I have a big time. Gay my little sister says she likes her birthday to. But I think I like my birthday bitter than She dose. I like presents very much.

(2) My Birth day is the best day to me. Because choclet cake is my favoite kind of cake. And I get a lots of toys. People have Birthdays because that day was the same day they were bron.

(3) I like Christmas best because I get toys and other surprises. Me and my family have fun and play games. We have fun taking trips, And I have fun at school. We play base ball at school.

Rating 6

(1) The day I like best of all is Christmas day. It's because its Jeuses birthday and I get Christmas presents and because my grandmother sometimes comes. And because I make other people happy because I give them presents too. And because my mother cooks such a good dinner that day too. Well, we talk a lot about out presents and we thank each other for them too. And because we sometimes go out to eat dinner and then go out to a show. And maybe the next day we would go on a picnic. I like Thanksgiving too. Because on that day we have as much food as we can eat. And it's so very good too. I wish you were There last time. Because that time I mean we had a feast. Not just any old feast, A great big feast. And I'm not joking. I sure like my birthday to. But still best of all the day I like best.

(2) I like Halloween the best. Sometime I have a Halloween party. It is very fun. We get lots of stuff to put on the wall. On other Halloweens we go trick or treat. Billy and I scare each other with the costumes. I take music and we have a Halloween reacital. We are suposte to were are Halloween suits. Last time I was so dum. I kept on takeing of and on my mask. I almost forgot. Halloween is the eve of all saints. I think saints is a very funny word.

APPENDIX C

Table 1

Intercorrelations Among Five Raters for Four Essay Topics

Rater Combinations	Essay Forms A(N= 266)	B(N= 203)	C(N= 258)	D(N= 290)	Means
I-II	.628	.756	.848	.738	.743
I-III	.674	.776	.839	.756	.761
I-IV	.616	.719	.819	.749	.728
I-V	.710	.659	.851	.733	.738
II-III	.713	.756	.760	.769	.747
II-IV	.760	.699	.777	.693	.732
II-V	.711	.719	.806	.758	.746
III-IV	.772	.699	.779	.731	.745
III-V	.789	.749	.793	.710	.760
IV-V	.770	.730	.780	.691	.743
Means	.709	.736	.815	.732	.744
Means via Fisher's *z*	.759	.731	.858*	.736	

*Differences between mean *r* of C and mean *r*'s of A, B, and D are significant at .01 level; no other combinations are statistically significant.

Table 2

Correlations Between Inexperienced Raters
With Different Academic Majors

Combinations of Rater Majors	Form	N	Coefficient
Lib. Edu. - Health	A	76	.50
Art - Pri. Edu.	B	100	.56
History - Art	C	100	.50
French - Lib. Edu.	D	74	.76
Pri. Edu. - Lib. Edu.	A	100	.79
English - Lib. Edu.	A	76	.77
English - Spanish	D	100	.58
		Mean =	.64

Table 3

Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for
Different Numbers of Inexperienced
Raters Rating Sixteen Papers

	Forms				
Numbers of Raters	A	B	C	D	Means
1	.602	.561	.739	.542	.619
3	.819	.793	.909	.780	.825
5	.883	.865	.943	.855	.887
14	.955	.950	.974	.943	.956

Table 4

Test Re-Test Reliability Coefficients
(Same Topic)

Forms	N	Raters per Essay	Coefficient
A_1-A_2	22	2	.687
B_1-B_2	25	2	.627
C_1-C_2	25	2	.574
D_1-D_2	25	2	.489
		Mean	= .594

Table 5

Test Re-Test Reliability Coefficients
(equivalent forms)

Forms	N	Raters per Essay	Coefficient
A - B	25	2	.614
A - C	26	2	.659
A - D	23	2	.710
B - C	21	2	.697
B - D	26	2	.622
C - D	28	2	.581
		Mean	= .647

Table 6

Comparison Reliabilities for Ratings with Criteria and Ratings with Models
(Both product-moment and Fisher's z coefficients are reported)

		Criteria		Models		Difference	
Forms	N	r	z	r	z	r	z
A	20	.446	.45	.716	.91	.250	.46*
B	20	.533	.59	.736	.95	.203	.36*
C	20	.697	.87	.711	.89	.014	.02
D	20	.333	.34	.384	.40	.053	.06

*Difference significant at the .01 level.

Table 7

Means* and Standard Deviations** for Raters and Topics (Test Forms)

Raters	Form A			Form B			Form C			Form D		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
I	267	3.22	1.24	203	3.89	1.24	258	3.52	1.32	290	2.82	1.17
II	267	3.87	1.48	203	4.09	1.59	258	3.98	1.76	290	3.09	1.56
III	267	3.24	1.31	202	3.67	1.56	258	3.29	1.29	290	2.57	1.20
IV	267	3.17	1.44	203	3.31	1.35	258	3.08	1.29	289	2.61	1.36
V	267	4.02	1.20	203	3.63	1.23	258	3.65	1.40	290	3.01	1.18
Mean		3.54	1.33		3.72	1.39		3.54	1.41		2.82	1.29

*The mean rating for form D is significantly different at the .01 level from the mean rating of all the other forms; no other differences are statistically significant.

**No differences (based on mean S.D.) between forms are statistically significant.

ADDENDUM, 1968

EDIEANN FREEMAN BIESBROCK. The Development and Use of a Standardized Instrument for Measuring Composition Ability in Young Children (Grades Two and Three). (Under the direction of L. RAMON VEAL.)

A standardized instrument of the product-scale class to be used with second and third grade children to measure the global quality of their composition on a seven-point scale was developed. An evaluative instrument resulted where compositions produced under standardized conditions were compared to a series of models that were actual samples of children's writing. The developed instrument was used to: (1) evaluate growth in composition ability over a period of two years; (2) examine possible relationships between growth and sex; (3) compare global quality ratings and several syntactic measures; and (4) examine relationships between global quality ratings and mental maturity scores (California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity), reading scores (the Reading Test of the California Achievement Tests), chronological age, sex, and grade level.

The sample compositions produced during the course of this study came from more than 2,000 second, third, and fourth grade students from nine elementary schools in Georgia, one in South Carolina, and one in North Carolina. Following procedures that ensured the selection of reliable models, five forms of the global essay test (each using a different essay topic) were developed. Rater reliability coefficients ranged consistently between the mid .60's and upper .70's. Equivalent forms reliability coefficients for the five forms also ranged between the mid .60's and upper .70's; and examinee reliability was checked at .70. The reading reliabilities were comparable to those reported in the Handbook for Essay Tests (1957) for the S.T.E.P. essay tests. In summary, the global rating of essay quality by comparison to models

proved to be an effective method of evaluating compositions at the second and third grade levels.

The growth study revealed a steady increase in global essay quality means for compositions produced by the children at four testing intervals (fall 1966, spring 1967, fall 1967, and spring 1968). Although the mean essay ratings for girls were higher than for boys, both boys and girls showed a steady growth trend during the two year period. The respective amounts of growth for boys and girls were not significantly different, thus indicating that, for the children of this study, the rate of growth was not related to sex. Certain measures of syntactic maturity correlated highly with essay ratings of global quality. These syntactic measures were the number of T-units (.75), the number of subordinate clauses (.71), and the number of all clauses (.80). The mean length of T-units did not correlate highly (.48) with global essay quality for this sample of second and third graders.

Intelligence quotient scores failed to reveal significantly high correlation with the global essay ratings (.43). Reading grade placement scores revealed significantly high correlation with the essay ratings (.65). A coefficient of .61 was obtained between global essay ratings and reading comprehension and a correlation of .68 between global essay ratings and vocabulary. The correlation between chronological age and global essay ratings failed to show a significant relationship (.22). The combined mean essay rating of second grade girls (3.74) and third grade girls (4.79) was significantly higher than the combined mean rating for second grade boys (3.71) and third grade boys (4.05), thus indicating that sex may be an important factor influencing test performance.

OE 6000 (REV. 3-68)

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACCESSION NO.

CLEARINGHOUSE ACCESSION NUMBER

RESUME DATE 06 — 30 — 68

P.A.

T.A.

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☒ NO ☐

TITLE

Materials for a Curriculum in Written Composition, K-6

Final Report

PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)

Rachel S. Sutton and Mary J. Tingle

INSTITUTION (SOURCE)

College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30601

SOURCE CODE

REPORT/SERIES NO. ECSC 20

OTHER SOURCE

none

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

OTHER SOURCE

none

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

PUB'L. DATE 06 —30 —68

CONTRACT/GRANT NUMBER HE 078, Contract OE 4-10-017

PAGINATION, ETC.

80 pp.

RETRIEVAL TERMS

English Curriculum Study Center
Materials for a Curriculum in Written Composition, K-6
Twenty Documents

IDENTIFIERS

Project No. HE 078, Contract OE 4-10-017

ABSTRACT

ECSC 20. Final Report. This document includes the rationale and basic research for a curriculum in written composition from kindergarten through grade six. It describes the design for the curriculum study center, the materials produced, and the evaluation of the use of these materials.